Case 3:14-mj-71520-MRGD Document 11 Filed 12/16/14 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR	3-14-mj-71520MAG	
Plaintiff, v.)))	STIPULATED UNDER THE	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME SPEEDY TRIAL ACT LED	
)		DEC 162014	
Defendant.)		RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on 2014, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from 12 (6 , 2014 to 20152014 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):				
Failure to grant a continuance w See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i		ely to result in a r	miscarriage of justice.	
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).				
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
	commitment		defendant continuity of counsel, given count the exercise of due diligence.	
Failure to grant a continuance we necessary for effective preparation See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(in the second	on, taking ir v).	nto account the e	xercise of due diligence.	
•	for ex	clerdira .5,1	June period undep	
DATED: <u>[)-/(6</u> /14		LAUREL BEE United States M	LER fagistrate Judge	
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	• t	Assistant Unite	d States Attorney	